

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1-4 and 6-10 are now in the application. Claims 1-4 and 6-10 are subject to examination. Claims 1 and 6 have been amended. Claim 5 has been canceled to facilitate prosecution of the instant application.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103" on page 2 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 1-2, 4, and 10 have been rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,389,065 to McGhee and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,246,694 to Chen under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

The limitations of claim 5 have been added to claim 1. Please see the discussion of the allowable subject matter that is provided below.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103" on page 4 of the above-identified Office Action, claim 3 has been rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,389,065 to McGhee and U.S. Patent No. 6,246,694 to Chen further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,715,277 to Goodson et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Please see the discussion of the allowable subject matter that is provided below.

Under the heading "Allowable Subject Matter" on page 5 of the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 5-9 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

The Examiner indicated that claims 5-9 "would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims."

Applicants appreciate the indication of Allowability. The limitations of claim 5 have been added to claim 1. Claim 6 has been amended to depend from claim 1.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claim 1. Claim 1 is, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art. The dependent claims are believed to be patentable as well because they all are ultimately dependent on claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-4 and 6-10 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate receiving a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

Please charge any fees that might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner Greenberg Stermer LLP, No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark P. Weichselbaum/
Mark P. Weichselbaum
(Reg. No. 43,248)

MPW:cgm

August 21, 2009

Lerner Greenberg Stermer LLP
P.O. Box 2480
Hollywood, Florida 33022-2480
Tel.: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101